DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 598 HE 007 339

TITLE	A Report of the Regents on the City University of New York.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	11 Dec 75
NOTE	75p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Budgeting; Cooperative Planning; *Economic Factors; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; *Equal Education; Financial Needs; Financial Policy; Governance; *Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; Student Needs; Tables (Data); *Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*City University of New York

ABSTRACT

The impact of the rapidly deteriorating fiscal situation in New York City threatens City University of New York (CUNY). The Board of Regents called on a Special Committee on Regents and a Task Force on the City University and asked them to formulate a plan that would preserve CUNY. They were directed to (1) identify educational priorities with consideration to budgetary limitation; (2) identify educational needs; (3) recommended measures that address CUNY's financial crisis; (4) propose a fiscal plan for the future; (5) consider potential contributions that other institutions can make in meeting the needs of postsecondary education in NYC; (6) recommend changes in structure and governance; and (7) recommend a plan for submission to the mayor, governor, and the legislature. Opinions were solicited from a broad cross section of people who are interested in CUNY. On December 10, 1975 the special committee and task force submitted a report to the Board of Regents. The board reviewed the report and with certain editorial changes adopted the report herein. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Truett

ED119598

Ser: B 2.2
B 3.3

A REPORT OF THE REGENTS ON THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE007 339

December 11, 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1981 Theodore M. Black, A.B., Litt.D., LL.D., Pd.D., D.C.L.
Chancellor ..... Sands Point

1987 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A.,
D.C.S., H.H.D., Vice Chancellor ..... Purchase

1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. ..... Troy

1980 Joseph T. King, LL.B. ..... Shelter Island

1981 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. ..... Brooklyn

1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., J.D., LL.D. ..... Glens Falls

1986 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D.
L.H.D., D.Sc. ..... Hastings on Hudson

1983 Harold E. Newcomb, B.A. ..... Owego

1988 Willard A. Genrich, LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D..... Buffalo

1982 Emlyn I. Griffith, A.B., J.D. ..... Rome

1977 Genevieve S. Klein, B.S., M.A. ..... Bayside

1981 William Jovanovich, A.B., LL.D., Litt.D.,
L.H.D..... Briarcliff Manor

1976 Mary Alice Kendall, B.S. ..... Irondequoit

1984 Jorge L. Batista, B.A., J.D. ..... Bronx

1982 Louis E. Yavner, LL.B. ..... New York

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
Ewald B. Nyquist

EXECUTIVE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
Gordon M. Ambach

PREFACE

The impact of the rapidly deteriorating fiscal situation in New York City threatens the very existence of the City University of New York. In a meeting in New York City on November 21, 1975, the Board of Regents called upon a Special Committee of Regents and a Task Force on the City University, composed of distinguished citizens, to develop a mutually acceptable plan of action for the University for presentation to the Regents on December 10, 1975.

The members of the Board of Regents appointed to the Special Committee were:

Willard A. Genrich, Chairman

Jorge L. Batista
Genevieve S. Klein
Harold E. Newcomb
Louis E. Yavner
Theodore M. Black, Chancellor, ex officio
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., Vice Chancellor, ex officio

The members of the task force were:

Porter R. Chandler
(Attorney and Former Chairman of the Board of Higher Education)

Harold Howe, II
(Foundation Executive and Former U.S. Commissioner of Education)

Mina Rees
(Educator, Former President, Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York; and Former President of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences)

Frank Schultz
(Bank Executive and Former Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning, The City University of New York)

Albert C. Stewart
(Industrialist and Treasurer of the New York State Dormitory Authority)

The Committee and Task Force were asked to formulate a plan which would preserve the City University of New York "as an independent body, integral to the life and role of the largest city in the United States and embodying the tradition that access to higher education must not be denied to anyone by reason of economic circumstances." They were further directed to:

1. Identify the educational priorities for the University and recommend a program for meeting those priorities, within reasonable budgetary limitations.
2. In identifying those priorities, give primary consideration to meeting the educational needs of the University's present and prospective student populations.
3. Recommend specific measures that will address the University's fiscal crisis in the current year, taking into account sources of funds from federal, State, municipal, and other sources.
4. Propose a fiscal plan that will take into account the University's financial needs for the next five years.
5. Consider the potential contributions that other institutions can make in meeting the needs for post-secondary education in New York City.
6. Recommend those appropriate changes in structure and governance that may follow from other recommendations to the Committee and Task Force.
7. Recommend a comprehensive plan for submission to the Mayor, the Governor, and the Legislature.

The Committee and Task Force met on November 25 and December 1 and 2 in New York City, and on December 9 in Albany. Direct testimony was heard from Dr. Alfred A. Giardino, Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee, and other members of the City University staff.

Opinions were solicited from a broad cross section of people who are interested in the City University. Requests for statements were sent to the University Student Senate, University Faculty Senate, Professional Staff Congress, SEEK Advisory Council, Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, Committee for Public Higher Education, Regents Regional Coordinating Council for Postsecondary Education in New York City, State University of New York Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities, and other selected individuals.

Testimony was presented by these as well as other interested parties at the joint hearings of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education and the Senate Committee on Higher Education in New York City on December 2, 1975 and in Albany on December 3, 1975. These statements as well as statements received directly by the Regents Special Committee and Task Force were reviewed and considered. A listing of the groups from which statements were considered appears in the appendix.

On December 10, 1975 the Special Committee and the Task Force submitted a report to the Board of Regents. The Board has reviewed the report and with certain editorial changes adopted the report herein.

The Regents wish to express sincerest gratitude and appreciation for the contributions of the individuals who served on the Special Committee and the Task Force. The commitment, and dedication, with which they accepted their responsibility and the insightful manner in which they responded to the difficult charge placed before them, are commendable. The Regents are indebted to them for the willing service they performed for the State's higher education community in preparing their thoughtful and comprehensive report.

The Regents are also grateful to the members of the staff of the State Education Department who provided the essential support to the Regents, their Special Committee, and the Task Force on City University. They wish to thank the following people who have done an outstanding job: T. Edward Hollander, William S. Fuller, Peter J. Keitel, Donald C. Martin, Charles G. Treadwell, Mary Van Ryn, Rose Lewis, Patricia Frank, Phyllis Gaudio, Florence Dooley, and Barbara Klein.

INTRODUCTION

THE CITY UNIVERSITY - A PERSPECTIVE

Educational Mission and Priorities

The City University of New York is the third largest university in the nation. It enrolls over 250,000 students, or approximately one out of every four students attending a college in New York State. The University offers a wide range of academic programs ranging from short-term certificate and technical programs to advanced studies at the post-doctoral level. Within the University, a wide variety of academically valuable curricula are available including: the liberal arts, health service technologies, business and commerce, education, and the physical and social sciences. As a result of its Open Admissions program, initiated in 1970, the University offers guaranteed admission to one of its colleges to every high school graduate of New York City.

Today, the City University of New York encompasses ten senior colleges, eight community colleges, a University graduate school, and an affiliated medical school. The University is basically an undergraduate system: Almost 90 percent of its total enrollment and 97 percent of its full-time students are engaged in undergraduate study. Nearly all of the University's undergraduates (and most of its graduate students) are residents of the City of New York.

The City University is an urban institution closely tied to the social and educational problems of the City. No other major university in the country enrolls as high a proportion of students from minority groups and students from poor homes, adults, prison inmates -- and others long denied higher education -- as does the City University.

Despite the fact that the City of New York has high living costs, the City University is able to offer its programs at a lower cost per student than other public institutions in the State.

The University meets a unique urban mission by providing successive generations of New York City residents, largely drawn from low-income families, an opportunity to gain an undergraduate collegiate education. The median family income, in fall 1974, of its community college students was $8,500; and the median family income of its senior college students was $10,500. Almost 75% of the University's full-time undergraduate students come from families with incomes of less than $14,000. About 12% of the senior college's full-time students and 8% of the community college's full-time students have family incomes of $20,000 or more.*

The University's low-income students pose a special educational problem for the colleges. These students tend to perform less well in high school than students drawn from middle- and high-income families. This finding applies especially to the City University. For example, 40% of the senior college freshmen from families with incomes of $6,000 or less read below the ninth grade level, compared to only 4% from families with incomes of $15,000 or more. If City University is to

---

*The distribution of students by family income level is based upon data for 1974 reported by the Board of Higher Education.

serve all communities in New York City, it must pursue a policy of equal opportunity. And if the collegiate experience is to be meaningful for all of its students, the University must provide some compensatory programs that will assure students a reasonable chance for success.

The City University has also excelled in extending opportunities to the City's minority populations. Its special opportunity programs (SEEK and College Discovery), as well as the Open Admissions Program, have opened avenues for higher education to members of minority groups and others who have traditionally been excluded from postsecondary education. Today, the University's student population represents the City's ethnic population.

The comprehensiveness of the City University has also made it possible for students to transfer freely among institutions and continue their studies to the highest level of their capability. The University continues -- one of the few in our country to do so -- to offer automatic transfer opportunities for its two-year college graduates to the four-year colleges. Approximately four out of ten community college graduates continue their studies beyond the associate degree.

Graduate studies are an important component of the University's programs. Several of the colleges of the City University have offered graduate programs for over fifty years. The City University was established in 1961, and the Regents authorized the University to offer doctoral programs in that same year. Since then, the University has been authorized to establish twenty-six doctoral programs and an increased number of master's degree programs.

The Regents authorized the establishment of the University Graduate Center to offer doctoral work and master's degree work at a central campus. The wisdom of this approach has been corroborated by the Commissioner's evaluations that found the University's programs to be among the highest quality in the State.

The University's efforts at the graduate level are relatively modest, accounting for only 7.8% of statewide full-time enrollments. Part-time graduate enrollments, concentrated largely in teacher preparation and professional fields, amount to 21% of the statewide total.

The graduate programs are more nearly self-sustaining than undergraduate programs. Graduate students pay a $70 general fee and, in addition, tuition of $75 a credit. These rates are among the highest for graduate study at a public institution. By comparison, the State University charges $40 a credit. Graduate tuition revenue amounts to $30 million annually out of total University fee revenues of $82 million. Graduate enrollments, on a full-time equivalent basis, constitute about 10% of total enrollment. The University's graduate programs, and especially its doctoral programs, are of high quality and are integral to the academic well-being of the total University and essential to its reputation.

Enrollments

Increased enrollment is the largest single factor explaining the University's recent sharp rise in expenditures. Enrollments grew rapidly in the 1960's as a result of increases in the City's college-age population. This growth had run its course in the early 1970's, but the University's undergraduate expansion continued owing to the establishment of the Open Admissions policy for the Fall 1970. Now, the impact of Open Admissions on undergraduate enrollments has leveled off.

As a result of the decline in the expected number of high school graduates identified by the Regents in their 1974 Progress Report* , the University can expect a decline in enrollment during the next five years, followed by a decline by as much as thirty percent of full-time enrollments in the mid-1980's.

Funding

In 1948, with the passage of State legislation which provided State aid for two-year colleges sponsored by local governmental or educational boards and for teacher training programs at City University, New York State became a co-sponsor of higher education in New York City. While the City has continued its support, and still contributes over half of the University's total budget, the State has gradually expanded its role and responsibilities for higher education in New York City and throughout the State. The legislation of 1948 also created the State University of New York, thereby establishing the State's responsibility to provide higher education opportunities to all citizens of New York.

The contribution of New York State to the City University has increased from aPproximately 18% of the total operating budget in 1948 to 41% in 1974. The State, on the other hand, has essentially supported all of State University's budget, excepting that portion financed through tuition revenues in excess of debt service requirements.

The current financial problems of the City make it impossible for the relationship of City and State, in their shared support of the University's operations, to continue in its present form. The City can no longer support the City University at the level it has maintained in the past.

---

*Postsecondary Education in Transition, the Regents 1974 Progress Report on the 1972 Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education.

Therefore, new configurations of financial responsibility must be devised.

There are many areas in which the University can still increase the effectiveness of its educational offerings, realign its programs, increase its productivity, and reduce its expenditures without detracting from the major missions of the University.

As new means of funding the University are considered, it is essential that the integrity of the institution be preserved. The University's role should be enhanced, not diminished. Its educational offerings should be strengthened, not weakened. Its ties to the City should be continued, not severed. Its graduate offerings should be consolidated, not eliminated. Finally, its Open Admissions policy should be improved, not abandoned.

CHAPTER I

THE FISCAL CRISIS

The City of New York cannot maintain current levels of support for the City University of New York.

For well over a century, New York City was the sole source of public support for the City's municipal college system (City College - 1847, Hunter College - 1870, Brooklyn College - 1930, Queens College - 1937). During this period, the scope of operations was limited, and financial needs were modest.

In 1948, the State provided its first support for the City's four senior colleges, financing in part, lower-division undergraduate studies and teacher education programs. At that time, the State's share covered 18% of the colleges' expenditures of $18 million.

During the next twenty years, the University's educational programs, enrollment, and budgets expanded dramatically. Sixteen new institutions were established. Enrollments grew from 50,000 to 120,000 students. Programs increased in variety and level, providing students with a wide choice of certificate, associate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral programs. The University's expenditures increased tenfold to almost $200 million. In 1965, the Legislature established the City University Construction Fund to finance needed facilities, and also provided State support at a level of 50% of the operating budgets of the senior colleges and graduate programs (after deduction of tuition and fee revenues). By 1968, the State share of the University's budget had

risen to 41% of the total expenditures, or $70 million.

The University adopted its present open enrollment policy in 1970. As a result, enrollments rose from slightly more than 120,000 full-time equivalent students in 1968 to 215,000 students in 1975. The University's operating expenditures, reflecting increased enrollments and rapidly rising costs, reached $585 million for the 1974-75 academic year.

The Board of Higher Education originally requested a budget of $702 million for the 1975-76 academic year. On December 1, 1974, this request was severely reduced by the Mayor as he certified an austerity budget for the University of $654 million, and asked that the State appropriate matching funds for that level of expenditures.

When the extent of the City's financial crisis became apparent in July 1975, the Mayor further reduced the University's approved expenditure level to $597 million, which was adjusted by the Board to $587 million.*

On July 28, 1975, only one month before the academic year was to begin, the Board of Higher Education adopted a program which increased revenues by $30 million and reduced expenditures by $57 million in order to meet the revised expenditure level. In so doing, the Board eliminated 3,688 full-time equivalent teaching and administrative positions, and reduced program offerings, library acquisitions, maintenance, and guard service.

After the academic year had begun, the City notified the University that it would have to make still further reductions in the University's budget amounting to approximately $55 million. These reductions were not accomplished during the Fall semester. The University, therefore has to absorb these cuts during the Spring semester, beginning February 1, 1976.

*The Board voted to increase fees by $30 million instead of the $40 million assumed by the Mayor's office.

In vain, the Board of Higher Education first sought emergency State aid, and then relief from the full amount of the budget reduction.

In November, the Board of Higher Education considered a plan for reducing expenditures by $55 million in the Spring semester, which called for the deferral of February admissions, a further reduction in college campus expenditures, the collection of summer school fees in advance, and the imposition of a four-week payless, forced furlough for the staff. The plan was not adopted by the Board.

The depth of the present fiscal plight of the City University is now apparent. Expenditures cannot be reduced by $55 million in the Spring semester without doing fundamental and irreparable harm to the University's present and prospective students. But, if the University continues to operate at the present level of spending, it will run out of money before the end of the academic year.

Even if new sources of funds were made available for this academic year, the University cannot be assured of reasonable fiscal stability in the future if it continues to rely upon the City as a major source of funding.

Several facts of the City's fiscal crisis bear directly on the University's future operations. The City of New York's Expense Budget, published in June 1975 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, provided for operating expenditures of $12.67 billion. After the Emergency Financial Control Board for the City of New York was established, an

expenditure level resulting in a ceiling of $11.8 billion for 1975-76 was authorized.* The Control Board has since approved a three-year plan for the City that calls for a reduction in operating expenditures to $10.3 billion for 1976-77, and a further reduction to $10.1 billion for 1977-78. Increases in costs due to rising debt service, pensions, and the results of inflation are to be absorbed within these declining budget ceilings. Detailed agency budget ceilings have not yet been approved by the Control Board, but it is clear that every City-financed program can expect significant cuts in financing. Further, in the case of the City University, every reduction by the City of its share of the University's budget is matched, dollar for dollar, by a reduction in the State share, thereby putting the University in double jeopardy.

It should also be kept in mind that half of the City's share of the University's operating budget ($114 million out of $238 million) is funded out of the City's capital budget. Assuming that borrowings are feasible this year, the University's long-term financing may be further jeopardized by the impropriety or impossibility of financing annual educational expenses through borrowed capital. The Control Board is seeking to eliminate the use of borrowed capital to finance operating budget items. If enacted, this change in policy will have a significant impact on the University's spending ability.

---

*The Emergency Financial Control Board came into being in October. It approved an expenditure level from the end of October to June 30, 1976 of $7.387 b. The $11.8 b. estimate includes the Control Board approved amount of $7.387 b. plus estimated expenditures from July, 1975 to the end of October.

The City's fiscal crisis is known. While the full dimensions of the State's fiscal problems are unclear, it is clear that the State cannot countenance the budget increases that it has been able to finance during the last several years.

The current year's deficit will require a combination of expenditure reductions and tax increases. The next several years are likely to be characterized by sharply limited State finances for increased expenditures. The State's existing higher education commitment for tuition assistance, increased community college enrollments, and State University financing are likely to require increased outlays. Any recommendations for future State financing of the City Univeristy beyond current commitments must take into account the State's fiscal circumstances, especially during the next two years.

CHAPTER II

LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

In formulating the recommendations set forth in this report, the Regents have attempted to safeguard the mission of the City University. All of the recommendations relate in some way to the strengthening and clarification of this mission, while at the same time assuring that the City University's financial situation be stabilized to allow it to pursue its educational objectives.

A second major conviction of the Regents is that higher education is a State function and that the continued viability of the City University can only be achieved through an orderly transfer of financial responsibility from the City to the State.

Finally, in seeking to anticipate the short- term and long-term needs of the City University, the Regents have been guided by these stated principles:

1. The City University of New York is an institution that must be preserved as an independent educational body, integral to the life of the largest city in the United States.
2. The City University should remain a comprehensive institution, encompassing the graduate center, senior colleges, and community colleges with articulated programs at all academic levels.
3. Access to higher education must not be denied to anyone by reason of economic circumstances.

4. Academic quality must be preserved in the context of providing educational services to a diverse population.

5. Undergraduate instruction should remain the primary academic mission of the University, though recognizing that graduate education (especially at the doctoral level) is of great importance to maintaining the quality of the University as a whole.

The following major considerations have also been taken into account:

1. The proportion of State assistance to the City University should be increased over a period of time.

2. Increases in the State tax levy in support of the City University and requirements for expanded student aid should be held to minimum levels for the State fiscal years ended March 31, 1977 and March 31, 1978 in order to meet stringent State budget requirements.

3. City contributions to the University budget should be decreased during the three-year period in amounts that are in accordance with the Emergency Financial Control Board's planned overall reductions of the New York City Expense Budget.

Four areas of particular concern to the long-term effectiveness of City University, in light of the present fiscal crisis, have been examined at length by the Regents: Access, Quality, Funding, and Governance. Specific recommendations relating to each of these areas are presented in the following pages.

Access: Admissions, Retention, and Enrollment

In order to maintain academic excellence, but not deny access to the students which the University has served so well, the Regents recommend that:

- *The City University should continue to offer admissions to all New York City high school graduates, admitting without condition those high school graduates, or equivalent students, who meet criteria that assure reasonable potential for successful completion of the program to which the student seeks admission. Students who do not meet these criteria should be admitted conditionally, and should be provided with the necessary remedial programs through special programs established for that purpose.*
- *The University also establish and enforce University-wide criteria for reasonable progress by a matriculated student toward a degree; students not meeting the criteria for reasonable progress should be dropped from matriculated status.*

The City University's full-time undergraduate enrollment has peaked. A decline from 1975 levels is now projected owing to the lower number of high school graduates available. The University is expected to experience reductions in its enrollments by

1,200 students in 1976, 2,700 students in 1977, 6,600 students in 1978, and 10,800 students in 1979 and 1980. These anticipated natural declines will result in savings of $1.8, $4.1 and $9.9 million, respectively, during each of the next three years.

New York City's independent (private) higher education institutions have stated their willingness to assist actively in the current crisis. Before the City University's adoption of the Open Admissions policy, several of New York City's independent colleges provided access to students who could not be admitted to the City University. The independent institutions now indicate that they can accommodate an additional 7,000 freshman students and 7,000 transfer students annually. They also have space for over 9,000 students at the graduate level.

Through the State and Federal financial aid programs, students from the lowest income groups can presently receive up to $2,900 in entitlements toward their college-going costs. These funds, complemented by amounts available from the State's special opportunity programs, federal college work-study awards, and college scholarship funds, make it possible for more low-income and low-middle-income students to attend independent colleges.

In their 1976-77 budget request, the Regents have recommended increases in funding for the State's Tuition Assistance Program and the State's special Higher Education Opportunity Program in order to allow low-income students to attend the college of their choice.

Recognizing the willingness of the independent institutions to be of assistance, the Regents recommend that:

- *The independent institutions in New York City be encouraged to accept additional responsibility for providing open access to freshmen and transfer students from New York City.*
- *The Governor and Legislature authorize the expansion of the Higher Education Opportunity Program by 1,700 places in independent colleges for the Fall 1976.*
- *The City University establish admissions procedures which indicate to the applicant possible independent institutions as an alternative, and which notify those institutions of student interest.*

In arriving at each of the recommendations in this section, attention has been given to the cost implications to ensure reasonable cost effectiveness.

Quality

The Regents are aware that the recommended criteria for admissions and retention relate to the issue of academic quality. However, the Regents remain convinced that the consolidation of current academic programs will actually maintain quality in the long term and will yield cost savings.

While the continuation of graduate work is essential to the University's mission, the Regents recommend that *the Board of Higher Education cut or consolidate those of its master's degree programs with relatively low enrollments.* Consideration should be given to limiting master's degrees at selected institutions. The Regents recommend that *no further doctoral offerings be undertaken for the present, and enrollments in doctoral programs be held to currently authorized levels. The President of the University Graduate School should take the initiative through the Regents*

Regional Coordinating Council for New York City, in establishing, in cooperation with independent colleges, joint doctoral offerings in those fields that show low or declining student demand.

Undergraduate programs will be significantly affected if the above recommendations on admissions and retention are in fact enacted. The Regents further recommend that *all undergraduate programs be restudied in terms of duplication of mission among the various campuses and the strengthening of the differing objectives on each campus regarding traditional liberal arts programs, the professions, and the technical and career programs.*

The University's eighteen senior and community colleges were established during a period when rapid enrollment growth was expected through the end of the century. Eight have been established within the last ten years. Several of the colleges that had been established as special purpose institutions have expanded beyond their integral mission to general purpose institutions.

The study of the mission of each campus, as reflected by the programs which are offered, will also serve to raise questions as to the continuance of the present University structure. The Regents recommend that *the Board of Higher Education appoint a task force to study the consolidation and merger of several of the existing institutions. The task force should also evaluate the cost effectiveness of administrative practices at the individual colleges and at the central office. The task force should report its results to the Board of Higher Education before March 15, 1976. The Board of Higher Education will give the report to the Regents and will incorporate its plans in the Board of Higher Education master plan for the City University on, or before, June 1, 1976.*

The present calendar of the University should be modified to utilize better faculty time and to increase productivity while maintaining a relatively high level of compensation. In addition, improved use of the existing limited facilities may also result from a change to a revised calendar along the quarter, trimester, or other model. The City University now expends over $16 million for rental space each year. It can no longer afford the luxury of operating a full program for its student body for only thirty out of the fifty-two weeks a year. The Regents, therefore, recommend that *a study of options to the present University calendar be undertaken in conjunction with the consolidation and cost study task force, or by an independent task force appointed by the Board of Higher Education.*

Funding

Education is a State responsibility. The State now funds the community colleges through an established statewide formula. The Regents believe that the State has a responsibility for financing all public four-year colleges and universities on the same basis for the same services. During the last two decades, the City University has established programs that are uniquely suited to the needs of New York City and its residents, including Open Admissions, special opportunity programs, programs for compensatory education, and public service programs. Additionally, the City University salary scale is substantially above that found at the State University.

The Regents recommend that *the State take full responsibility for the financing of the City University as soon as possible, excluding those programs, tuition waivers, open enrollment and admissions policies, retention criteria, services, administrative costs, and faculty compensation levels*

which are special to the City and that the City maintains or seeks to support. The proposals contained in this section are intended to cover an interim three-year period. During this period, the Regents ask the State to assume increased financial responsibility for the City University reaching 75% of the net operating costs of the City University senior colleges. The City share would cover the special programs available to New York City residents that relate to New York City's unique urban needs.

The Regents specifically recommend that:

- *The City of New York seek to continue its support of the University to cover special services as a local option, although on a reduced scale.*
- *The State further increase support of the City University over a three-year period, by raising the support level for senior colleges from the current 50% of net operating costs and debt service costs in three steps to 55% in 1976-77, 65% in 1977-78, and 75% in 1978-79.*

The revised funding levels also apply to the financing of senior college projects by the City University Construction Fund. Although the Regents did not deal with the current problems of construction, they recognize that critical projects have been shut down. Projects which are required to upgrade the very minimal space per student at the City University and to provide for the replacement of rental space should be resumed as soon as it is financially feasible to do so.

Tuition is no longer a major barrier to students attending public colleges. Financial aid programs have been developed that offset the cost of tuition as well as other costs of college attendance. The State Tuition Assistance Program and the federal grant, work-study and loan programs offset, in whole or in part, the total costs of attending a public college for those

least able to pay.

Tuition charges for undergraduate matriculants at the City University will qualify eligible students for increased federal Basic Educational Opportunity Grants of up to $350 per year. The State's Tuition Assistance Program and federal grants will "hold harmless," at present fee levels, approximately 40% of CUNY's full-time undergraduates. The Tuition Assistance Program will partially offset tuition for over 90% of City University's full-time undergraduates, that is, those with family taxable incomes of $20,000 or less (gross income level of $25,500 or less).

There is a special concern for residents of the City in the middle-income ranges who may not be able to afford tuition. There is precedent for the establishment of special tuition waiver or grant programs at public colleges that would further reduce the impact of tuition for such students.

As a matter of equity, tuition should be based on ability to pay. Therefore, on the conditions of increased appropriations for the Tuition Assistance Program and increased State funding for the senior colleges, the Regents recommend that:

- *City University adopt a policy of charging tuition to undergraduate students at rates of $325 per semester for full-time matriculated, or $21.50 per credit hour for all part-time, lower division students, and $400 per semester for full-time matriculated and $26.75 per credit hour for all part-time, upper division students. Charges to non-City residents and graduate students will not be affected.*
- *City University suspend the charging of general fees to matriculated undergraduate students.*
- *City University expand its student aid counseling capabilities to assist students in making application for Tuition Assistance Program Grants and federal assistance they may be eligible for.*

- *City University, as a local option, establish a tuition waiver program to assure that full-time matriculated undergraduate students, from families with gross incomes of about $14,000 or less,* do not incur tuition charges that exceed their present fees.*

These recommendations will result in low-income students receiving increased aid that will make the cost of attendance less than it is now. Part-time non-matriculated students will pay reduced tuition charges. And approximately 75% of the full-time undergraduate students will pay no more than they do now.

Governance

Between 1900 and 1923, the State legislature created separate boards of trustees to govern City College and Hunter College. The Board of Higher Education was established in 1927, by combining the separate boards of trustees and adding three new members. By 1961, the Board of Higher Education was comprised of 22 members appointed by the Mayor, including the Chairman of the Board of Education, serving ex officio. The Board elected its own officers, and established committees for each of the colleges within the University system.

In 1973, the State provided for a new governing board of eleven members. The Chairman and six other members were appointed by the Mayor, while the Vice-Chairman and two other members were appointed by the Governor. The President of the Board of Education serves ex officio and without vote as the eleventh member. In 1975, the State Legislature mandated the appointment of the President of the University Student Senate, ex officio and without vote, as the twelfth member.

*Equivalent to an adjusted net taxable balance of $8,500 or less.

The Regents recommend that *the Board of Higher Education be restructured to give recognition to the increased State responsibility for financing the City University of New York.* The Board should consist of 15 members, with authority to establish subcommittees, elect its officers, organize its operations, and write its by-laws. Recommendations on the reconstitution of the Board are as follows:

Membership

- *There will be 15 Board members.*
- *All members must be residents of the City of New York at the time of their appointment and throughout the duration of their terms.*
- *Members may not be administrators or officers of other educational agencies, or members of other education boards during their term, except as herein provided.*

Appointment

- *The Governor of the State of New York will appoint 8 members of the Board -- 3 of whom will serve as representatives "at large" and 5 who will be chosen from, and representative of, the five boroughs.*
- *The Mayor of the City of New York will appoint 7 members of the Board -- 2 of whom will serve as representatives "at large" and 5 who will be chosen from, and representative of, the five boroughs.*

Ex officio, non-voting members

- *The President of the Board of Education, or another member designated by the Board of Education, will be an ex officio, non-voting member.*
- *The President of the University Student Senate will be an ex officio, non-voting member.*
- *The Chairman of the University Faculty Senate will be an ex officio, non-voting member.*
- *Ex officio members will not be counted in the determination of a quorum.*

Term of Appointment

- *Board terms will be seven years.*
- *Appointments will be staggered so that terms are overlapping.*

Chairmanship and Vice-Chairmanship

- *The chairman and the vice-chairman will be elected by the members of the Board.*
- *Individuals are eligible to serve as chairman or vice-chairman for two successive, two-year terms only.*

CHAPTER III

SHORT-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

The City University of New York faces a major budget gap that has been stated to be $55 million for the 1976 Spring semester. Because of the budget cuts that already have been made this year, additional reductions at this time will require considerable sacrifice. To preserve the basic integrity of the University and to avoid undue hardships, all members of the City University community are called upon to bear an equitable portion of the overall constriction that must take place. In addition, the State of New York must accept a special responsibility for meeting the short-term deficit.

The short-term recommendations are consistent with the long-term recommendations which the Regents have made. The two sets of recommendations are deemed inseparable and the Regents consider them to be integral parts of a comprehensive program. All of the elements of the recommendations are interrelated. They should be enacted together. The Regents recommend tuition, based upon ability to pay, on the condition that the long-term recommendations for increased State financing increased appropriations for the Tuition Assistance Program, and governance are accepted by the Board of Higher Education, the City of New York, and the State of New York.

The University Administration

The City University has had to contend with approximately $100 million in cuts this year since the initial Board of Higher Education budget approval, and has responded in a responsible and sensible manner. Additional reductions at this time will be extremely difficult to undertake, but the Regents believe it is possible to make further, if modest, reductions without significantly harming the University's

functions. They, therefore, recommend that:

- *The University close all operations during its Spring recess to save costs of fuel and maintenance. This would save an estimated $.6 million.*
- *The University effect short-term economies by mandating modest reductions among its colleges according to the specific programmatic recommendations of the Board of Higher Education. The total amount of these reductions should be at least $6 million.*

The Faculty

The City University's faculty have already suffered the elimination of over 3,500 full-time equivalent positions in the current year. The Regents have been informed that the City University is moving toward a staffing ratio of 21:1 from the present 16.1:1. Teaching loads and class size have increased. In addition, members of the faculty will not receive salary increments this year as they have in the past.

Even so, the City University administration, in allocating budget reductions, has thus far sought to minimize the impact on full-time faculty members. No full-time faculty member has yet been laid off or has suffered a salary reduction. Salaries of City University faculty remain among the highest in the nation; and they are on the average 20% higher than salaries at the State University.

The Regents are aware that the faculty and staff will be required, through recently enacted legislation, to contribute 2 1/2 percent of their annual salaries to their pension fund, thus relieving the University of a portion of its contribution. This personal contribution will save the University a total of $3.0 million in the Spring semester.

In addition, the Regents recommend that, *on a one-time-only basis, faculty and professional staff members who earn more than $12,700 annually be required to forego their normal salaries for one week.** This will reduce the University's expenditures during the Spring semester by $5 million.

The Students

The students at City University are the ultimate beneficiaries of efforts aimed at maintaining the institution with its diversified services and high quality. While these students should be protected against excessive financial burdens, it is reasonable to expect that students share in the sacrifices that must be made. In the past, students have borne increases in fee payments, and have thus contributed to the University's revenues. Yet current fee levels are such that additional increases might make the cost of attending City University prohibitively high for large numbers of students of lower economic status.

The Regents have therefore concluded that they can best assure that no student should be denied admission because of economic circumstances by recommending that tuition charges be imposed in the Spring 1976 semester. Specifically, on the conditions of increased appropriations for the Tuition Assistance Program and increased State funding for the senior

---

*Vice Chancellor Pforzheimer, Regent Clark and Regent Yavner dissent from the recommendation that faculty and staff forego one week's salary as a means to meet the current year's budget gap. They point out that the faculty and staff have already increased their workload substantially through additional class hours of teaching and increased class sizes as a result of the previous budget reduction made by the City University at the beginning of this academic year. They also point out that pay cuts have been imposed on no other City employees this year. The proposed action would be inequitable; Regent Batista joins on the basis of the latter reason. Task Force members Rees and Howe also dissented from the Special Committee and Task Force recommendation on this point.

colleges, the Regents recommend that:

- *City University adopt a policy of charging tuition to undergraduate students at rates of $325 per semester for full-time matriculated, or $21.50 per credit hour for all part-time, lower division students, and $400 per semester for full-time matriculated and $26.75 per credit hour for all part-time, upper division students. Charges to non-City residents and graduate students will not be affected.*
- *City University suspend the charging of general fees to matriculated undergraduate students.*
- *City University immediately expand its student aid counseling capabilities to assist students in making application for Tuition Assistance Program grants.*
- *City University, as a local option, establish a tuition waiver program to assure that full-time matriculated undergraduate students, from families with gross incomes of $14,000 or less,* do not incur tuition charges that exceed their present fees.*

The above recommendations will serve to accomplish the following major objectives:

1. Full-time, matriculated undergraduate students from low-income families will pay reduced charges or receive increased benefits.
2. Tuition will be reduced for all part-time non-matriculants.
3. Approximately 75% of the existing full-time matriculated

*Equivalent to an adjusted net taxable balance of $8,500 or less.

undergraduate student body will receive sufficient student aid so that they will pay no more than they now do in fees.

4. Revenues net of all student aid will be increased by $13.6 million. The revenue realized by the imposition of tuition for the Spring semester should be appropriated to the City University to help meet the gap in the University's current budget.

The State

In assessing the desirability of additional State support, the Regents have considered the possibility that the State of New York should make available $55 million to cover the full amount of the University's cash deficit. They concluded that the State should not do so, as it now faces a current deficit which has been certified by the State Comptroller to be $700 million. Such an additional State fiscal responsibility at this time would serve to increase the deficit, or result in a reduction elsewhere in the State's budget. Further, the State plans to meet its full obligation to the University in the current year, as required by the present statutory funding arrangements.

It should also be noted, however, that the State has benefited inadvertently by the multiple reductions in City funds allocated to the University. The State appropriation for the City University, which is made available on a matching basis with City funds, will show an appropriation in excess of expenditures required in the current year of $20.9 million. In addition, the freeze on new construction will lower the requirement for the State contribution to debt service payments in the first quarter of the next fiscal year by about $15 million.

While it is obvious that the State has no legal obligation to contribute these funds in direct or indirect support of the University, it is the opinion of the Regents that such support is warranted for the following reasons:

1. The State is in a better position to provide additional subsidy than is the City.
2. An increase in the State's role for financing City University is consistent with the long-term financing plan proposed by this membership.

In view of the above observations, the Regents recommend that:

- *The State make $4.6 million available to the University as a one-time emergency allocation.*
- *The State appropriate an additional $22.2 million to meet the expected deficit in the Tuition Assistance Program.*

Summary

The financial implications of the short-term recommendations are outlined in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Summary of
Short-Term Recommendations
For Closing the Budget Gap of
$55 million for 1975-76

	Estimates (millions of dollars)
I. Expenditure Reductions	
Close facilities during winter and spring recess	$ 0.6
Programmatic reduction for balance of academic year	6.0
Faculty contribution to pension	3.0
Faculty with salaries of $12,700 or more forego one week's salary	5.0
II. Increased Revenues*	
Establishment of tuition charges for students from families with gross incomes of $14,000 or more (after taking into account tuition waivers)	35.8
III. Increased State Aid**	
Emergency State Appropriation	4.6
	$55.0

*Requires increase in State Tuition Assistance estimated at $22.2 million based upon Board of Higher Education estimates of student family income levels.

**A possible source of State funds to cover the $26.8 million of State monies ($22.2 million for tuition assistance and the special appropriation of $4.6 million) is the appropriation for CUNY in excess of expenditure requirements of $20.9 million in the State's 1975-76 fiscal year budget and the $15 million reduction in funds needed for the first semi-annual payment to the City University Construction Fund required in the State 1976-77 fiscal year. The reduction in debt-service requirement results from the temporary moratorium on new bonding to finance City University construction.

A STATEMENT BY REGENTS BATISTA, CLARK, JOVANOVICH AND YAVNER
AND TASK FORCE MEMBERS REES AND STEWART

The report to which we have subscribed contains recommendations which, if implemented, could have far-reaching consequences. Not only would they affect State-local relationships in connection with higher education, but also, more important perhaps, they might affect the perceptions that various groups in our State and local communities have about their mutual obligations and rights.

We have supported these recommendations with the understanding that they embody certain basic principles and agreements. We are assured that they do. In order that there be no misunderstanding, we state them plainly:

We are deeply concerned by the fact that the State of New York funds the State University at a rate substantially higher than the rate at which it provides for the City University. This disparity is a gross inequity to the residents of New York City, accented by the present fiscal crisis. We challenge this disparity and seek a policy commitment and program approach to correct this inequity. The Report recommends this commitment and this approach.

We seek fiscal parity for the City University with the State University, to be achieved through a State funding mechanism that provides funds to the City University to support all its programs and policies on the same basis as that used to support the State University's comparable programs and policies. This would provide funds to both systems on a basis fair to all residents of the State. In addition, it would allow the City to expend its own funds to provide services and programs to its residents to meet their local needs.

Injustice to New York City should be rectified without creating injustice for upstate taxpayers; equity flows both ways. Certain City programs and policies, it seems clear, should not be fundable within the fiscal parity program recommended. For example, to meet its local needs the City University, with the support of successive City administration, has adopted open admission and faculty compensation policies that are more costly than the State University's. If continued, these policies should be funded locally and not as part of "fiscal parity."

Moreover, for political and psychological reasons, the slogan "free tuition" is counterproductive. The slogan contributes to discord and misunderstanding; its objective can be attained better now through the tuition waiver policy recommended in the Report.

This locally-funded local-option system, in a framework of fiscal parity, not only represents a substantial increase in the level of State aid to the City University and a substantial reduction in the level of funding that the City of New York must provide, but also it provides the opportunity for the City University to continue worthwhile educational efforts. We urge the City of New York and the City University to continue to support these local options.

APPENDIX A

STAFF WORK PAPER ON THE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REGENTS SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE ON CITY UNIVERSITY

I. Implications for Students

Students, who are qualified and motivated to pursue a higher education, should not be denied access because of limited financial resources. However, tuition is no longer the major financial barrier to students attending public colleges because more equitable ways of providing financial assistance have been developed.

The City University has determined that the current cost of attendance for an academic year is $1,700 for a dependent student and $3,600 for an independent student. These costs include books, fees, travel, lunches, and other living costs. Despite the lack of tuition, almost 44,000 City University students receive financial assistance, not including graduate waivers, assistantships and fellowships. It is doubtful that the City University could have experienced the full enrollment growth of the last several years without large amounts of financial assistance for the non-tuition costs of attendance.

As recently as three years ago, government grant aid to undergraduate students was limited to a relatively small number of federal grants that

even the poorest students could not be assured of receiving, and State tuition grants that would not cover the full tuition at public colleges for the same students.

Since then, two highly significant *entitlement* grant programs have been developed. The word entitlement means that *everyone* who applies for these grants, and is eligible, receives a grant. Students are not rejected because of a lack of funds. The federal Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG) provides grants of up to $1,400 per year based on income and the approved costs of attendance.* The federal basic grant cannot exceed one-half the cost of attendance. Thus, a dependent student at the City University, no matter how poor, cannot now receive more than $825 per year.

In 1974, the State replaced the Scholar Incentive Award program with the Tuition Assistance Program. The Tuition Assistance Program can only be used to offset actual tuition charges. Low-income students in their first two years of study receive TAP awards of $1,500 at independent colleges; the awards cover full tuition at public colleges. Students in their second two years of study will receive $200 less per year when the program is fully phased in. The new schedule of awards is being implemented at the rate of one class each year. However, because of several changes to the old schedule of awards, students at public colleges receive similar awards under either schedule.

These two programs are designed to help remove the financial barrier to education, especially for low-income students. They are more effective in meeting this objective than free tuition. The following table shows

---

*For the Basic Educational Opportunity Program the allowable cost of attendance for students at the City University is now established within the range of $1,600 to $1,650.

the amounts that City University students at several income levels, who are in their first two years of study pay now and would pay under the proposed tuition and fee schedule. Appendix Tables A II-V show additional data on students at different income levels and in different years of study. The significance of the income levels chosen is that approximately 25% of the lower division students fall below the $5,000 income level, 50% below $10,000, 75% below $14,000 and 90% below $20,000.

Table A-I
Impact of Tuition Proposal on Full-Time
Matriculated Lower Division Students Per Semester

Gross Income	Average Equivalent Taxable Balance[a]	Current Charges, General Fee[b]	Tuition	TAP	Increase in Federal Basic Grant	Proposed Special Tuition Waiver	Net Tuition	Net Add'l Amount Payable
$6,000	$1,500	55	$325	$325	$120	-0-	(120)	(175)
10,000	5,500	55	325	218	50	52	5	(50)
14,000	8,500	55	325	110	0	160	55	0
20,000	14,500	55	325	50	0	0	275	220

[a]Based on standard deductions and average family sizes at CUNY.
[b]Senior college fee is shown. The fee at community colleges is $30.

The average student at the $6,000 income level would have his full tuition paid by the TAP program, and would receive an increase in the Federal grant award of $120 per semester. Since the student would no longer have to pay the general fee, he would pay *$175 per semester, or $350 per year less* to attend a City University senior college if tuition were charged. The comparable charges for students attending community colleges is $150 per semester and $300 per year. Thus, one-fourth of the lower division students would be *significantly better off* if tuition were charged.

Students at the $10,000 income level would be slightly better off because the tuition waiver would cover the small amount not paid by the TAP program and the students would receive increased Federal grant awards. Without a special waiver program, students whose family income falls between the upper one-half and the upper three-fourths of the income scale would have to pay increases in tuition that would be burdensome. A proposed special tuition waiver program would "hold harmless" all students at or below the $14,000 gross family income level ($8,500 net taxable balance).

The only students who will have to pay additional sums will be those who can best afford to do so. Students at the $20,000 gross income level receive TAP awards of $100 per year. This, coupled with the savings on the general fee, results in an increased cost of $220 per semester or $440 per year. Some might argue that the upper-income City University students might transfer to independent colleges once tuition were imposed. Should these students evaluate the choice between types of college solely on the basis of cost rather than on quality or program offerings, they are likely to make the same decision they have made under the current free tuition policy. These upper-income students will find the cost at the City University is still $2,000 to $2,500 less than at an independent college even if tuition is charged at City University.

Table A-II

Impact of Tuition Proposal on Full-time

Matriculated Lower Division Students Per Semester

Gross Income	Average Equivalent Taxable Balance[a]	Current Charges, General Fee[b]	Tuition	TAP[c]	Increased BEOG	Waiver	Net Tuition	Net Additional Amount Payable
$4,000	$ 0	$55	$325	$325	$140	$ 0	$(140)	$(195)
6,000	1,500	55	325	325	120	0	(120)	(175)
8,000	3,500	55	325	280	80	0	(35)	(90)
10,000	5,500	55	325	218	50	52	5	(50)
12,000	7,000	55	325	165	10	105	45	(10)
14,000	8,500	55	325	110	0	160	55	0
16,000	10,500	55	325	50	0	0	275	220
18,000	12,500	55	325	50	0	0	275	220
20,000	14,500	55	325	50	0	0	275	220
22,000	16,500	55	325	50	0	0	275	220
24,000	18,500	55	325	50	0	0	275	220
25,500	20,000[d]	55	325	50	0	0	275	220

[a]Based on standard deductions and average family sizes at CUNY (assumes 20% of students have another family member in college).

[b]Senior College fee is shown. The general fee at Community Colleges is $30.

[c]Based on schedule C which applied to students who began study after July 1, 1974.

[d]TAP Awards are not made above this income level.

Table A-III

Short-Range Impact of Tuition Proposal on Full-time Matriculated Upper Division Students Per Semester

Gross Income	Average Equivalent Taxable Balance[a]	Current Charges, General Fee[b]	Tuition	TAP[c]	Increased BEOG[d]	Waiver	Net Tuition	Net Additional Amount Payable
$4,000	$ 0	$55	$400	$300	$80	$45	$(25)	$(80)
6,000	1,500	55	400	300	70	45	(15)	(70)
8,000	3,500	55	400	250	40	95	15	(40)
10,000	5,500	55	400	183	25	162	30	(25)
12,000	7,000	55	400	133	5	212	50	(5)
14,000	8,500	55	400	83	0	262	55	0
16,000	10,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
18,000	12,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
20,000	14,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
22,000	16,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
24,000	18,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
25,500	20,000[e]	55	400	50	0	0	350	295

[a] Based on standard deductions and average family sizes at CUNY (assumes 20% of students have another family member in college).

[b] Senior College fee is shown. The general fee at Community Colleges is $30.

[c] Based on schedule B which applies to students who began study before July 1, 1974. This schedule will remain in effect until the 1977-78 academic year.

[d] Applies to approximately half the upper division students in 1975-76. The average should double in 1976-77.

[e] TAP Awards are not made above this income level.

Table A-IV

Intermediate Range Impact of Tuition Proposal on Full-time

Matriculated Upper Division Students Per Semester

Gross Income	Average Equivalent Taxable Balance[a]	Current Charges, General Fee[b]	Tuition[c]	TAP	Increased BEOG	Waiver	Net Tuition	Net Additional Amount Payable
$4,000	$ 0	$55	$400	$400	$165	$ 0	$(165)	$(220)
6,000	1,500	55	400	400	135	0	(135)	(190)
8,000	3,500	55	400	355	85	0	(40)	(95)
10,000	5,500	55	400	293	50	52	5	(50)
12,000	7,000	55	400	240	10	105	45	(10)
14,000	8,500	55	400	185	0	160	55	0
16,000	10,500	55	400	95	0	0	305	250
18,000	12,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
20,000	14,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
22,000	16,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
24,000	18,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
25,500	20,000[d]	55	400	50	0	0	350	295

[a]Based on standard deductions and average family sizes at CUNY (assumes 20% of students have another family member in college).

[b]Senior College fee is shown. The general fee at Community Colleges is $30.

[c]Based on schedule C awards for lower division students who began study after July 1, 1974. The so-called upper division reduction applied after students have received 2 years worth of awards. CUNY students who did not receive a TAP award in their first year of study will receive awards at the lower division rate for one year of upper division study.

[d]TAP Awards are not above this income level.

Table A-V

Long Range Impact of Tuition Proposal on Full-time

Matriculated Upper Division Students Per Semester

Gross Income	Average Equivalent Taxable Balance[a]	Current Charges, General Fee[b]	Tuition	TAP[c]	Increased BEOG	Waiver	Net Tuition	Net Additional Amount Payable
$4,000	$ 0	$55	$400	$300	$165	$45	$(110)	$(165)
6,000	1,500	55	400	300	135	45	(80)	(135)
8,000	3,500	55	400	255	85	90	(30)	(85)
10,000	5,500	55	400	193	50	152	5	(50)
12,000	7,000	55	400	140	10	205	45	(10)
14,000	8,500	55	400	85	0	260	55	0
16,000	10,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
18,000	12,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
20,000	14,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
22,000	16,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
24,000	18,500	55	400	50	0	0	350	295
25,500	20,000[d]	55	400	50	0	0	350	295

[a]Based on standard deductions and average family sizes at CUNY (assumes 20% of students have another family member in college).

[b]Senior College fee is shown. The general fee at Community Colleges is $30.

[c]Based on schedule C for upper division students who began study after July 1, 1974. This schedule will apply to upper division CUNY students when the program is fully phased-in.

[d]TAP Awards are not made above this income level.

II. Implications for the City University

The long-term plan assures fiscal stability for the next three years, without altering the University's basic mission, compromising the academic quality of its offerings, forcing abandonment of high quality graduate studies, or excluding opportunities for its students.

The membership has proposed several measures for strengthening and consolidating the University's institutional structure and academic offerings. The membership recognizes that the Board of Higher Education has primary responsibility for determining the specific measures that need to be taken and the timetable for their implementation. The timing and level of budget reductions, that are achievable, will depend upon the Board of Higher Education's specific program for consolidation. Yet the staff has estimated that the possible savings resulting from the implementation of the membership's recommendations will increase from approximately $35 million in 1976-77 up to $65 million in 1978-79.

III. Implications for the State

The implementation of these recommendations will result in the continuation of a comprehensive higher education system responsive to the City of New York without requiring the excessive costs of a massive State takeover of the University's operations, financing, and governance. The recommended progressive increase in State support from the current level of 50% to 75% over a three-year period, accompanied by the institution of tuition, will result in a modest amount of State support in actual dollars, while assuring the University's financial stability.

The following table shows the State's share of the total City University budget between 1974-75 and 1978-79:

Table A-VI
State Share of The City University Budget
(in millions)

	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
Total Anticipated CUNY Operating Budget*	$585	$570	$549	$534	$522
State Share	242	205	196	220	243
Percent of Total Operating Budget	41.3%	35.9%	35.7%	41.1%	46.5%
State Contribution Including Increased Tuition Assistance	244	231	240	262	282
Percent of Total Operating Budget Including Tuition Assistance	41.7%	40.5%	43.7%	49.0%	54.0%

*These figures reflect anticipated reductions that may be effected by the Board of Higher Education through the implementations of the membership's recommendations, but exclude expenditures, if any, for increased debt-service, pension costs, and cost increases resulting from inflation.

The actual increase to the State over the next three years will be approximately $20 million a year, which is the same annual amount that the State's contribution to City University has increased since the 1972-73 allocation. The total State's share of $282 million in 1978-79 is only about $40 million more than the State's contribution of $244 million in 1974-75.

IV. Implications for the City

Both the short-and long-term recommendations of the membership fall well within the expenditure levels imposed by the Emergency Financial Control Board of the City of New York. In fact, while total City expenditures must be reduced by 20% from the original $12.67 billion New York City Expense Budget by 1977-78, the illustrative financial plan proposed would permit a total reduction in the City contribution for the City University of almost 40%. The total City expenditure levels and the City share of the City University budgets are shown below.

Table A-VII (in millions)

	Original 1975-76	Emergency 1975-76	1976-77	1977-78
New York City Total Budget	$12,670.0	$11,800.0[a]	$10,300.0	$10,100.0
Percent Reduction from Original 1975-76 Budget		6.9%	18.8%	20.3%
City Share of CUNY Budget	275.3	237.3	203.0	168.0
Percent Reduction from Original 1975-76 Budget		13.9%	26.3%	39.0%

[a]Based upon estimated expenditures prior to the establishment of the Control Board and the Control Board's reduced ceiling for the period October 25, 1975 to the end of the City's fiscal year.

Furthermore, the proposal for 1978-79 would reduce the City share of the CUNY budget by more than half the original 1975-76 level. Thus, the City will be well on its way toward funding the City University at a greatly reduced and affordable level. Over the long term, City funds should continue to be used in support of the City University's unique educational and tuition waiver programs that contribute to the social and economic well-being of New York City.

APPENDIX B

A Staff Work Paper - Background Data

Table of Contents

I. History

A. Chronology of Key Historical Events at the City University.....B-1.1
B. The Individual Colleges of the City University.....B-1.3

II. Enrollments

A. Enrollment Growth at the City University, 1969-1975.....B-2.1
B. Undergraduate Enrollments in New York State, 1969-1974.....B-2.2
C. Degree Credit Enrollment at The City University of New York by College, Fall 1974.....B-2.3
D. Distribution of New York State Enrollments, Fall 1974.....B-2.4
E. Projections of High School Graduates in New York City, 1974-75 to 1990-91.....B-2.5
F. Revised Undergraduate Enrollment Projections for the City University.....B-2.6

III. Students

A. Graduation/Retention Rates of City University Senior College Students, by Ethnic and Income Groups.....B-3.1
B. Graduation/Retention Rates of City University Community College Students, by Ethnic and Income Groups.....B-3.2
C. Reading Scores of 1970 Freshmen at the City University, by Income Group.....B-3.3

IV. Finances

A. Summary of Financing of the City University, 1975-76.....B-4.1
B. Relative Shares of State, City, and University Funds in Support of CUNY Expenditures, 1948-1975.....B-4.2
C. Comparison of City University and State University Student Charges...B-4.3
D. Public Sector Undergraduate Tuition and Required Fees By State, 1974-75.....B-4.4
E. Distribution of Family Income of Matriculated Undergraduate Students at the City University, Fall 1974.....B-4.8

V. Facilities

Summary of Facilities Capacity at the City University, by College.....B-5.1

Chronology of Key Events in the History of City University of New York

1847 - Free Academy established by public referendum (later renamed City College), free tuition, City tax supported, offered a full collegiate curriculum, open to men only.

1849 - Free Academy officially opened.

1854 - Legislation passed to allow the granting of degrees by the Free Academy.

1870 - Normal College established as a part of City College to provide higher education for women (later renamed Hunter College).

1900 - State Legislature created a Board of Trustees for City College.

1915 - State Legislature created a separate Board of Trustees for Hunter College.

1927 - State Legislature established the Board of Higher Education - combining the Boards of Trustees of City College and Hunter College and added three new members.

1930 - Brooklyn College established.

1937 - Queens College established.

1947 - New York City Community College established.

1948 - State Legislature provided State aid to two-year colleges sponsored by local governmental or educational boards, and State aid to CUNY for teacher training.

1955 - Staten Island Community College established.

1957 - Bronx Community College established.

1958 - Queensborough Community College established.

1961 - Amendment of Education Law created The City University of New York, and continued the appointment of members of the Board of Higher Education by the mayor of New York City.

1962 - First doctoral programs established.

1963 - Manhattan and Kingsborough Community Colleges established.

1964 - John Jay College of Criminal Justice established.

1965 - Graduate Center created, and Richmond College established. CUNY financing changed.

1966 - York College established.

1967 - City University formally affiliated with Mount Sinai Medical School.

1968 - Bernard M. Baruch, Herbert H. Lehman Colleges, and Eugenio Maria de Hostos and Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community Colleges established.

1970 - Open Admissions instituted.

1971 - Medgar Evers College established.

1973 - State legislation reduced the size of the Board of Higher Education from 21 to 11 members, with the governor appointing three, the mayor appointing seven, and the president of the Board of Education was made an exofficio member. This legislation took away the Board's power to select its own chairman and made this the designee of the mayor with the governor's designee to be vice chairman.

1975 - State legislation added a twelfth member to the Board of Higher Education, the president of the University Student Senate (exofficio). A second chapter of the law separated the community colleges sponsored by the Board from the supervision of State University.

The Individual Colleges of the City University

Name of Institution	Date Established	Location	Special Mission
Seniors Colleges:			
Bernard M. Baruch College	(1919) * 1968	17 Lexington Ave. New York City 10010	Business Administration and General Purpose
Brooklyn College	1930	Bedford Ave. & Avenue H Brooklyn 11210	General Purpose
City College	1847	Convent Ave. at 138th Street New York City 10031	Education, Engineering,& General Purpose
Herbert H. Lehman College	(1932)* 1968	Bedford Park Blvd. West Bronx 10468	General Purpose
Hunter College	1870	695 Park Ave. New York City 10021	Health, Social Work, and General Purpose
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	1964	315 Park Ave.So. New York City 10010	Criminal Justice and General Purpose
Medgar Evers College	1971	1150 Carroll St. Brooklyn 11225	Professional & Technical
Queens College	1937	Flushing 11367	General Purpose
Richmond College	1965	130 Stuyvesant Pl. Staten Island 10301	Upper Division
York College	1966	150 14 Jamaica Ave. Jamaica 11432	General Purpose

*Date established as schools within existing colleges.

Continued

Name of Institution	Date Established	Location	Special Mission
COMMUNITY COLLEGES:			
Bronx Community College	1957	University Ave. & W. 181st St. Bronx 10453	General Purpose
Hostos Community College	1968	260 W. 161st St. Bronx 10451	Bilingual (Spanish-English)
Kingsborough Community College	1963	Oriental Blvd. Manhattan Beach Brooklyn 11235	General Purpose
LaGuardia Community College	1968	31-10 Thomson Ave. Long Island City 11101	Cooperative Education
Manhattan Community College	1963	1633 Broadway New York City 10019	General Purpose
New York City Community College	1947	300 Jay St. Brooklyn 11201	Technical
Queensborough Community College	1958	Springfield Blvd. & 56th Ave. Bayside 11367	General Purpose
Staten Island Community College	1955	715 Ocean Terr. Staten Island 10301	General Purpose
GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER	1965	33 W. 42nd St. New York City 10036	Doctoral

NEW YORK STATE

FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT AT COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES IN NEW YORK STATE, FALL 1969 TO FALL 1974

Institutional Type	Fall 1969	Fall 1970	Fall 1971	Fall 1972	Fall 1973	Fall 1974	Percent Change Fall 69 Fall 74
Four Year Institutions							
State University	78,849	87,953	93,121	93,865	99,272	104,493	32.5%
City University	54,345	67,247	77,905	81,426	84,511	87,056	60.2
Independent	170,128	171,949	172,022	167,483	163,463	170,374	0.1
Total Four Year	303,322	327,149	343,048	342,774	347,246	361,923	19.3
TWO YEAR INSTITUTIONS							
State University	68,625	76,856	82,827	84,840	88,779	93,086	35.6
City University	21,676	29,408	35,925	39,554	41,557	43,938	102.7
Independent	5,450	5,573	5,216	5,293	6,378	6,046	10.9
Total Two Year	95,751	111,837	123,968	129,687	136,714	143,070	49.4
Total State	399,073	438,986	467,016	472,461	483,960	504,993	26.5%

Source: Opening Fall Enrollment Reports (edited), the Higher Education Data System, New York State Education Department.

Degree Credit Enrollment at The City University of New York, by College, Fall 1974

Institution	Undergraduate		Graduate & 1st Professional	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Total CUNY	130,994	88,130	5,536	26,952
Senior Colleges	87,056	47,702	5,536	26,452
Graduate Center	-	-	2,129	869
Baruch	8,274	3,419	1,483	2,775
Brooklyn	20,379	9,277	129	5,641
City	12,600	4,270	448	3,648
Evers	1,497	947	-	-
Hunter	4,862	9,874	795	4,905
Jay	8,976	3,716	68	1,083
Lehman	8,580	5,494	64	2,099
Queens	16,642	8,379	325	3,921
Richmond	1,413	957	95	1,511
York	3,833	1,369	-	-
Community Colleges	43,938	40,428	-	-
Bronx	5,903	7,785	-	-
Hostos	2,186	343	-	-
Kingsborough	5,806	3,261	-	-
LaGuardia	2,694	1,549	-	-
Manhattan	5,101	4,411	-	-
New York City	8,849	9,228	-	-
Queensborough	7,167	8,655	-	-
Staten Island	6,232	5,196	-	-

Source: Opening Fall Enrollment Reports (edited), the Higher Education Data System, New York State Education Department.

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW YORK STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ENROLLMENTS, BY TYPE AND CONTROL OF INSTITUTION, FALL 1974

	Undergraduate			Graduate and Professional				
	Full-Time	% of Total	Part-Time	Full-Time	% of Total	Part-Time	Headcount	Total
Private Institutions	176,400	34.9	53,200	41,300	67.3	73,500	344,400	37.4
Four-Year	170,400	33.7	51,900	41,300	67.3	73,500	337,100	36.6
Two-Year	6,000	1.2	1,300				7,300	.8
State University of New York	197,600	39.1	87,300	14,600	23.8	25,700	325,200	35.3
Four-Year	104,500	20.7	16,800	14,600	23.8	25,700	161,600	17.5
Two-Year	93,100	18.4	70,500				163,600	17.8
City University of New York	131,000	25.9	88,100	5,500	9.0	26,500	251,100	27.3
Four-Year	87,100	17.2	47,700	5,500	9.0	26,500	166,800	18.2
Two-Year	43,900	8.8	40,400				84,300	9.1
Total All Institutions	505,000	100.0	228,600	61,400	100.0	125,700	920,700	100.0

Source: Opening Fall Enrollment Reports (edited), The Higher Education Data System, New York State Education Department.

PROJECTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES
IN PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS
IN NEW YORK CITY BY BOROUGH

1974-75 To 1984-85, and 1990-91

Borough	Actual	Projected											
	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1990-91
Manhattan	12,071	12,063	11,874	12,819	12,140	11,852	11,415	11,200	10,827	10,353	9,840	9,549	--
Bronx	12,143	11,994	12,071	12,397	12,435	12,339	12,343	12,251	11,954	11,325	10,806	10,052	--
Brooklyn	22,990	21,212	21,003	19,958	20,443	19,665	19,110	18,827	18,446	17,886	17,095	16,068	--
Queens	19,325	19,168	19,894	20,114	19,714	19,821	19,623	19,187	19,009	18,705	17,920	17,049	--
Richmond	4,112	4,147	4,332	4,262	4,358	4,341	4,386	4,429	4,544	4,358	4,359	4,227	--
TOTAL	70,641	68,584	69,174	69,550	69,090	68,018	66,877	65,894	64,780	62,627	60,020	56,945	42,859

SOURCE: The New York State Education Department, Information Center on Education

Revised Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment Projections

for The City University

	1975	1976	1977	1978
High School Graduates	68,600	69,200	69,500	69,100
Enrollment @ Current Standards:				
Full-Time First Time Freshmen	39,900	40,200	40,500	40,100
Total	132,600	131,400	129,900	126,000
Reduction from 1975 Level		1,200	2,700	6,600

SOURCE: The New York State Education Department

Graduation-Retention Rates After Two, Four, and Six Semesters by Race-Ethnicity and Median Family Income of Residential Area: Fall 1970, 1971, 1972, and 1973 Senior College Freshmen - CUNY

Residential Area Characteristics	Total First Semester Freshmen	Two Semester Retention	Four Semester Retention Graduation	Six Semester Retention Graduation
Senior Colleges:				
Fall 1970 Cohort:				
Black, PR; Below $8,000	2,951	87.3	71.2	57.2
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	655	91.9	75.9	64.9
White; Below $8,000	1,215	88.4	75.1	63.0
White; $8,000-11,999	8,598	91.2	79.2	68.8
White; $12,000+	3,810	92.4	79.5	71.2
Fall 1971 Cohort:				
Black, PR; Below $8,000	3,051	85.7	66.9	50.2
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	813	88.9	73.9	58.9
White; Below $8,000	1,228	86.6	68.6	55.4
White; $8,000-11,999	8,913	89.9	75.0	63.0
White; $12,000+	3,854	90.8	77.1	65.4
Fall 1972 Cohort:				
Black; PR; Below $8,000	3,411	85.3	63.5	
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	840	87.6	69.0	
White; Below $8,000	1,175	81.7	65.3	
White; $8,000-11,999	9,131	88.8	72.6	
White; $12,000+	3,674	90.0	75.6	
Fall 1973 Cohort:				
Black, PR; Below $8,000	3,479	83.8		
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	821	87.7		
White; Below $8,000	1,266	83.9		
White; $8,000-11,999	9,024	87.5		
White; $12,000+	3,383	89.0		

SOURCE: Student Retention and Graduation at The City University of New York; Fall 1970 to Spring 1974, June 1975, Office of Program and Policy Research, City University of New York (table 21, p. 51)

Graduation and Retention After Two, Four, and Six Semesters by Race-Ethnicity and Median Family Income of Residential Area: Fall 1970, 1971, 1972, and 1973 Community College Freshmen - CUNY

Residential Area Characteristics	Total First Semester Freshmen	Two Semester Retention	Four Semester Reten.-Grad.	Six Semester Reten.-Grad.	Percent Graduating From CC After: Four Sem.	Six Sem.
Community Colleges:						
Fall 1970 Cohort:						
Black, PR; Below $8,000	2,122	80.2	60.7	44.6	5.2	17.3
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	531	84.2	64.4	47.1	4.3	16.4
White; Below $8,000	769	79.7	59.0	45.0	6.5	18.7
White; $8,000-11,999	5,483	81.4	61.4	47.3	9.4	23.3
White; $12,000+	2,571	84.0	62.8	47.6	9.5	24.4
Fall 1971 Cohort:						
Black, PR; Below $8,000	3,073	78.1	56.6	41.6	5.1	15.8
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	677	81.0	60.9	47.7	5.3	18.3
White; Below $8,000	933	77.4	58.6	43.3	6.4	20.4
White; $8,000-11,999	6,642	79.4	58.8	44.1	7.6	21.5
White; $12,000+	2,954	81.7	60.5	45.9	7.9	21.8
Fall 1972 Cohort:						
Black, PR; Below $8,000	3,121	81.3	57.6		2.8	
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	711	81.9	60.8		4.4	
White; Below $8,000	921	81.1	56.9		4.9	
White; $8,000-11,999	6,469	80.2	58.8		7.3	
White; $12,000+	2,991	82.1	60.2		7.8	
Fall 1973 Cohort:						
Black, PR; Below $8,000	3,573	81.1				
Black, PR; $8,000-11,999	812	81.8				
White; Below $8,000	1,184	79.6				
White; $8,000-11,999	6,447	80.4				
White; $12,000+	2,933	81.6				

SOURCE: Student Retention and Graduation at The City University of New York; Fall 1970 to Spring 1974, June 1975, Office of Program and Policy Research, City University of New York (table 22, p. 52)

Reading Scores of Freshmen
Entering the City University in the
Fall 1970 by Income Level

Median Family Income Level	Senior Colleges		Community Colleges	
	Number of Students in Sample*	% of Sample Below 9th Grade Level	Number of Students in Sample**	% of Sample Below 9th Grade Level
$ 0 - 5,999	689	38.3%	481	60.1%
6,000 - 7,999	2,527	28.3	1,672	53.1
8,000 - 9,999	2,310	10.6	1,460	33.0
10,000 - 11,999	5,443	6.6	3,189	26.2
12,000 - 14,999	2,573	3.4	1,641	18.8
$15,000 and Over	648	3.9	364	13.2
TOTAL	14,190	11.9%	8,807	32.4%

* Total number of first-time full-time freshmen in 1970 - 19,231; number of students in sample - 14,190. Sample represents 73.8% of total.

** Total number of first-time full-time freshmen in 1970 - 14,676; number of students in sample - 8,807. Sample represents 60.0% of total.

SOURCE: Response to Special Data Request supplied by Lawrence Podell, University Dean for Program and Policy Research, City University of New York, December 2, 1975.

Summary of Financing of
The City University of New York
1975-76
(millions of Dollars)

	1974/75 Data[a]	1975-76 Budgets		
		Certification by Mayor 12/1/74[b]	July 28, 1975 BHE Approved Spendable Budget[c]	October 15, 1975 Mayor's Proposed Budget[c]
Budgeted Level of Expenditures*	$585.2	$654.7	$587.4	$527.4
Sources of Funding				
City:	280.1	323.6	275.3	238.2
Tax Levy			161.2	123.7
Capital Budget			114.1	114.1
State Aid	242.5	269.3	218.1	195.8
Tuition and Fees	50.4	52.0	82.0	82.0
Other	12.2	9.8	12.0	11.4

* Includes City share of debt service cost and required contribution to pension system and other fringe benefits included in other sections of City of New York budget, but applicable to City University

Sources: a) The City University of New York, "The Chancellors Budget Request for 1975-76" p.53.
b) The City University of New York. Certification as approved by the State.
c) The City University of New York.

Relative Shares of State, City, and University Funds
in Support of University Expenditures, Selected Years

City Fiscal Year	CUNY Expenditures (millions)	State	City	University Fee Income	Other
1948-49	$18	18%	63%		
1949-50	19	20	70		
1954-55	28	23	60		
1959-60	47	27	54		
1964-65	87	36	46		
1967-68	172	41	45		
1970-71	323	42	42	14.98	1.02
1971-72	382	41	43	15.12	0.88
1972-73	443	47	41	11.15	0.85
1973-74	528	42	48	10.49	0.51
1974-75	585	41	48	9.95	1.05
1975-76					
Mayor's Cert. Budget	655	41	48	7.51	1.49
July 28, City Budget	587	37	47	13.96	2.04
Mayor's Current Props.	527	37	45	15.84	2.16

Sources: (1) Master Plan of the Board of Higher Education for the City University of New York, 1968, p. 172.
(2) The City University of New York, The Chancellor's Budget Requests for 1970-71 through 1975-76.
(3) The City University of New York, Office of the Budget.

Comparison of City University and State University Charges

	Basis	CUNY Senior Coll.	CUNY Comm. Coll.	SUNY-State Operated	
Graduate:					
Tuition					
FT	Semester	$ 750		$600	
PT	Per Credit	75		40	
Fees					
FT	Semester	70		12.50	
PT	See note	70/sem.		.85/cr.	
Out of City or State					
FT	Semester	1,000		750	
PT	Per Credit	95		50	
Undergraduate					
Matriculated:				Lower Div.	Upper Div.
Tuition					
FT	Semester	-0-	-0-	325	$400
PT	Per Credit	-0-	-0-	21.50	26.75
Fees					
FT	Semester	55	30	47.50	47.50
PT		30/sem.	20/sem.	Coll. fee .85/cr. Std. Act. 8.25/sem. avg.	.85/cr. 8.25/sem. avg.
Out of City or State					
Ft	Semester	700	700	537.50	650
PT	Per Credit	55	55	35.75	43.50
Non-Matriculated:					
Tuition					
FT (see PT)	Semester	NA	NA	325	400
PT	Per Credit	30	25	21.50	26.75
Fees					
FT	Annual	55	30	47.50	47.50
PT		30/sem.	20/sem.	Coll. fee .85/cr Std. Act. 8.25/sem. avg.	.85/cr 8.25/sem. avg.
Out of City or State					
FT	Semester	700	700	537.50	650
PT	Per Credit	55	55	35.75	43.50

UNDERGRADUATE TUITION AND REQUIRED FEES
By State - 1974-75
Public Institutions

(Undergraduate in State)

		Tuition & fees Per Year
Alabama	- University of Alabama	$595
	- Alabama A&M University	330
Alaska	- University of Anchorage	340
	- University of Fairbanks	320
Arizona	- Arizona State University	370
	- Northern Arizona University	336
Arkansas	- University of Arkansas	400
	- State College of Arkansas	400
California	- University at Berkeley	637
	- California State U. - Fresno	197
Colorado	- University of (Boulder)	638
	- Colorado State University (Ft. Collins)	609
Connecticut	- University of Connecticut (Storrs)	715
	- Central Conn. State College (New Britain)	601
Delaware	- University of Delaware	625
	- Delaware State College	386
Florida	- University of Florida (Gainesville)	585
	- Florida State University (Tallahassee)	585
Georgia	- University of Georgia (Athens)	543
	- Columbus College	396
Hawaii	- University of Hawaii (Monoa)	350
	- University of Hawaii (Hilo)	279

[continued]

		Tuition & Fees Per Year
Idaho	- University of Idaho (Moscow)	$380
	- Boise State University	356
Illinois	- University of Illinois (Chicago Circle)	636
	- Eastern Illinois University	599
Indiana	- Indiana University (Bloomington)	722
	- Ball State University	720
Iowa	- University of Iowa (Iowa City)	620
	- Iowa State Univ. Science & Tech. (Ames)	600
Kansas	- University of Kansas (Lawrence)	482
	- Emporia Kansas State College	402
Kentucky	- University of Kentucky (Lexington)	480
	- Eastern Kentucky University (Richomond)	434
Louisiana	- State University (Baton Rouge)	320
	- Northeast Louisiana University (Monroe)	332
Maine	- University of Maine (Orono)	575
	- University of Maine (Presque Isle)	450
Maryland	- University of Maryland (College Park)	708
	- Frostburgh State College	646
Massachusetts	- University of Massachusetts (Amherst)	550
	- Lowell State College	335
Michigan	- University of Michigan (Ann Arbor)	800
	- Grand Valley State College	585
Minnesota	- University of Minnesota (Mineeapolis)	714
	- Mankato State College	477
Mississippi	- University of Mississippi	530
	- Jackson State University	432
Missouri	- University of Missouri (Columbia)	580
	- Southwest Missouri State University	360

[continued]

		Tuition & Fees Per Year
Montana	- University of Montana	529
	- Montana State University	510
Nebraska	- University of Nebraska (Lincoln)	555
	- Kearney State College	532
Nevada	- University of Nevada (Las Vegas)	530
	- University of Nevada - Reno	524
New Hampshire	- University of New Hampshire	982
	- Keene State College	737
New Jersey	- Rutgers University (New Brunswick)	585
	- Montclair State College	685
New Mexico	- State University (Las Cruces)	474
	- New Mexico Highlands University	339
New York	- State University at Buffalo	742
	- State University College at Brockport	740
No. Carolina	- University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill)	453
	- North Carolina State University (Raleigh)	488
No. Dakota	- University of North Dakota (Grand Forks)	467
	- Dickinson State College	429
Ohio	- University of Ohio (Athens)	780
	- Ohio State University (Columbus)	780
Oklahoma	- University of Oklahoma (Norman)	445
	- East Central State College	355
Oregon	- University of Oregon (Eugene)	540
	- Oregon State University (Corvallis)	561
Pennsylvania	- State University (University Park)	960
	- Edinboro State College	770
Rhode Island	- University of Rhode Island	797
	- Rhode Island College	511

[continued]

		Tuition & Fees Per Year
So. Carolina	- University of South Carolina (Columbia)	584
	- South Carolina State College (Orangeburg)	480
So. Dakota	- University of South Dakota	586
	- South Dakota State University	613
Tennessee	- University of Tennessee (Knoxville)	417
	- Middle Tennessee State University	374
Texas	- University of Texas (Austin)	393
	- Midwestern University	270
Utah	- University of Utah (Salt Lake City)	480
	- Weber State College	432
Vermont	- University of Vermont	1,088
	- Johnson State College	710
Virginia	- University of Virginia	627
	- George Mason University	740
Washington	- State University	564
	- University of Washington	564
W. Virginia	- University of West Virginia	310
	- Glenville State College	232
Wisconsin	- University of Wisconsin (Madison)	573
	- University of Wisconsin (Parkside)	528
Wyoming	- University of Wyoming (Laramie)	430

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Higher Education Directory 1974-75

Distribution of Family Income of Matriculated Undergraduate Students Enrolled at City University, Full-Time and Part-Time, Fall 1974

Gross Income	Full-Time Students			Part-Time Students
	Senior Colleges	BHE Community Colleges	Total CUNY	Total CUNY
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
$ 0 - 1,999	4.8%	7.1%	5.5%	2.0%
2,000 - 2,999	3.9	5.6	4.5	1.4
3,000 - 3,999	4.1	5.5	4.6	1.7
4,000 - 4,999	4.6	6.0	5.1	2.8
5,000 - 5,999	5.9	8.0	6.6	5.0
6,000 - 6,999	4.4	5.9	4.9	4.7
7,000 - 7,499	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.9
7,500 - 7,999	3.3	4.3	3.6	3.9
8,000 - 8,999	5.8	6.8	6.2	7.5
9,000 - 9,999	5.8	5.6	5.7	6.9
10,000 -11,999	13.4	12.0	12.9	14.1
12,000 -13,999	10.2	8.6	9.7	11.5
14,000 -14,999	5.4	4.0	4.9	5.9
15,000 -16,999	7.1	5.1	6.4	8.6
17,000 -19,999	5.8	3.8	5.2	7.3
20,000 or more	12.2	7.8	10.7	12.9
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SOURCE: The City University of New York.

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES CAPACITY OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK (FALL, 1974)

SENIOR COLLEGES	Net Assignable Square Feet*	NASF/FTE**	%Owned (NASF)	%Rented (NASF)
Baruch	361,689 [1]	30.86 [2]	73 [3]	27 [4]
Brooklyn	1,510,249	57.91	85	15
City	1,360,270	83.70	95	5
Medgar Evers	166,783	76.72	31	69
Hunter	819,266	51.18	84	16
John Jay	317,561	47.31	61	39
Lehman	471,582	41.77	79	21
Queens	1,100,514	52.17	93	7
Richmond	172,250	65.87	80	20
York	231,189	52.79	69	31
COMMUNITY COLLEGES				
Bronx	548,192	56.59	99	1
Hostos	68,963	34.81	0	100
Kingsborough	227,458	36.48	81	19
LaGuardia	228,699	55.11	79	21
Manhattan	217,983	37.02	0	100
New York City	689,353	57.49	83	17
Queensborough	420,930	41.46	100	0
Statan Island	258,579	37.53	84	16
GRADUATE SCHOOL	181,941	75.23	100%	0
TOTAL	8,651,265		83%	17%

Exclusive of Current Construction

*Net Assignable space (also net assignable area, net assignable square feet, N.A.S.F.):the sum of all areas on all floors of the institution's buildings assigned to, or available for assignment to, and occupant, including every type of space functionally usable by an occupant except custodial, circulation, and mechanical areas.

**Full-time equivalent student (F.T.E.): a theoretical number of full-time students having the same need for space as does the actual total enrollment of full-time, part-time, evening, nonmatriculated, and graduate students; in New York State calculated as the sum of full-time students plus one-third of part-time students.

[1]NASF from "Gree" Report - 1974. Gross square feet and net assignable square feet of buildings for The City University of New York. Office of Campus Planning and Development Department of Space Planning and Management.

[2]F.T.E. from No. 33 - Memorandum to Chief Executive Officers of Institutions of Postsecondary Education in New YOrk State

[3]Ibid. (1)

[4]Ibid. (1)

Appendix C

List of Individuals Who Testified Before the Joint Legislative Higher Education Committee on The City University

The statements of the following individuals and organizations were available for analysis:

Robert Abrams	-	Bronx Borough President
George Bugliarello	-	President, PINY and Chairman of CICU's Committee on New York City Higher Education
Ann Burton	-	Professor and Secretary, University Faculty Senate
Peter Caws	-	Professor and Chairman, Doctoral Faculty Policy Committee
Cándido Antonio deLeón	-	President, Hostos Community College
Murray Frank	-	Associate Director of Education, District Council 37, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
Alfred Giardino	-	Chairman, Board of Higher Education
Jay Hershenson	-	Chairperson, University Student Senate
Robert Iosue	-	Vice-President for Academic Affairs, C.W. Post Center on L.I.U.
Maynard Jones	-	Vice-Chairman, Fiscal Affairs-University Student Senate
Robert Kibbee	-	Chancellor, CUNY
Robert Kirkpatrick	-	President, Student Association of SUNY
Mischa Lazoff	-	President, Interboro Institute
Robert Marshak	-	President, City College
John Meng	-	Chairman, Governor's Task Force on Higher Education
Joseph Murphy	-	President, Queens College
Henry Paley	-	President, Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities
Harold Proshansky	-	President, Graduate Center of CUNY

Paulette Roy	-	President, Doctoral Alumni Organization
Archie Spigner	-	Councilman, 17th District (Queens)
David Valinsky	-	Chairman, University Student Senate
Jacqueline Wexler	-	President, Hunter College
Arnold Witte	-	Executive Vice-President, New York Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Belle Zeller	-	President, Professional Staff Congress

Committee for Public
Higher Education